



Community Sounding Board Meeting

March 27, 2007

Attendees

Community Members		Others	
Chris Moon	Steve Hatch	Ned Hacker, WFRC	Jim Horrocks, Horrocks Engineering
Dan Adams	Jill Hatch	Charles Mace, UDOT	Brad Powell, Horrocks Engineering
Bill Eccleston	Troy Flinders	Andy Neff, UDOT	Mack Christensen, Horrocks
Heidi Semadeni	Harris Adams	Ryan Bankhead, Layton City	Lori Isenberg, Northwest Dynamics
		Tom Roylance, Layton City	

Lori Isenberg, facilitator, welcomed the group and conducted introductions. Jim provided updates

1. Updates

- Utah Transit Authority (UTA) and the Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC) have joined the study as participating agencies. Steve Meyer will represent UTA, Ned Hacker and/or Andy Li will represent WFRC.
- Funding for this project is currently being discussed in the legislature in conjunction with the proposed State Transportation Implementation Plan. The legislature is gathering public input through Sept. If the funds are allocated, the project could be started within two years. At this time the “project” is what is on the WFRC long range plan, which is Alternative 2. However, that does not affect this study. The EIS process will determine the specific Build Alternative, or the No-Build Alternative.

2. Overview of the draft of Chapter 1, Purpose and Need

Following introductions, Jim distributed Draft Chapter One. He explained the project purpose statement remains basically the same as presented at the last CSB meeting and at the public meeting. The project needs reflect input received from the CSB and from the public, as well as data from our technical studies. Our intent is to write this EIS in a “reader friendly” format to present the information in a way that can be more easily understood by the public than it may have been in previous documents.

As for the next step in the process, the range of alternatives to be evaluated has been developed, based in part on input from the CSB and the suggestions received at the public meeting. In addition to the four alternatives discussed in our CSB meetings and presented at the public meeting, a fifth alternative has been added. This new alternative will consider whether improvements to the Layton Hills Mall Interchange will meet the project purpose and need. The alternatives evaluation and screening will be discussed in upcoming CSB meetings. Other issues that will be discussed in future CSB meetings include potential impacts to the social, economic, and natural environment.



Jim asked the CSB members to review the chapter and respond either via email or phone call with not only comments on the project purpose and need, but also on how it is written and if it is presented in an understandable way.

3. *Schedule*

The schedule was reviewed

- Phase I, completed:
 - Prepare Purpose and Need Statement and Identify full range of alternatives.
- Phase II tasks were explained:
 - Conduct detailed analysis of alternatives
 - Select preferred alternative
 - Additional public review and comment

Dates discussed for specific activities are noted below:

- March 27th: CSB meeting; project team will provide a preliminary overview of the traffic modeling
- April 25th: CSB meeting for in-depth discussion of traffic modeling and plans for the next Public Information Meeting
- May 2nd: Additional CSB meeting if needed to continue discussion of alternatives and prepare for the next Public Information Meeting
- End of May: Public Information Meeting to present traffic modeling for each of the build alternatives and receive feedback on which ones should be advanced to be included in the draft environmental impact statement.
- May 23rd: CSB meeting
- June 27th: CSB meeting
- July 25th: CSB meeting
- Aug. 22nd: CSB meeting
- Sept. 26th: CSB meeting
- Oct. 24th: CSB meeting
- Nov. 2007: Second Public Information Meeting to present screening of alternatives and gather feedback.
- Neighborhood meetings as needed

Horrocks would like to have the draft document ready for review by the end of the year. Then there will be a gap of two-three months for the legal sufficiency review, followed by the Public Hearing in May or June of 2008.

4. *Presentation on Traffic Modeling preliminary results*

The Horrocks team is working through the traffic modeling for each of the five Build Alternatives discussed with the CSB at the last meeting (listed below). They explained that the WFRC traffic model was found to not be as sensitive as needed to accurately identify the origin / destination of the traffic through the study area. Therefore, Horrocks is conducting additional modeling in sub-areas. The group went through each of the alternatives. Jim and Mack explained the exercise the engineers are going through with the traffic model: make assumptions based on the city master plan, then make adjustments to try to reduce the congestion. Then determine if it will achieve the Purpose and Need.



A CSB member questioned that 700 South was a 5 lane road on the Master Plan. The group checked the master plan and saw that it is.

Alternatives

- No Action Alternative
- Alternative 1 -- Widen Kaysville 200 North and upgrade other north/south streets.
- Alternative 2 -- Upgrade the South Layton Interchange to a full interchange over I-15 to connect to the proposed Minor Arterial master-planned for approximately 750 South.
- Alternative 3 -- Widen Gentile Road to four or more lanes and construct a new I-15 Interchange.
- Alternative 4 -- Construct a North-bound on ramp to I-15, construct a South-bound off ramp from I-15 to Gentile Road, and widen Gentile Road to five lanes from the new partial interchange to Bluff Road.
- Alternative 5 -- Due to the September 26, 2006 public meeting, a fifth alternative was developed and includes constructing additional lanes and other improvements to enhance the east/west flow of traffic, and constructing a grade-separated railroad crossing on Hill Field Road.

Wrap-up

Lori asked the group if they might need an additional meeting to go over the modeling results. The group decided to add a meeting for May 2nd, which can be dropped if it is not needed. Meeting was adjourned at 8:00.